

MINUTES OF THE CLARKDALE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING
OCTOBER 6, 2021
CLARKDALE MEMORIAL CLUBHOUSE, ZOOM
6:30 PM

Chair Snyder opened the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

Because there were approximately 30 members of the public in attendance, Chair Snyder proposed reordering the agenda so that the Plateau at Clarkdale items (6C and 6D) could be heard first.

Motion by Member Foutz, second by Member Kelly to reorder the agenda and consider the items related to the Plateau at Clarkdale (items 6C and 6D) prior to items 6A and 6B, Highlander Laundromat Signage. 5 years, 0 days. Motion carries.

Item 6C: Public Hearing, Plateau at Clarkdale Multifamily Project

Community and Economic Development Director Mayday gave a presentation regarding the role and obligations of the Design Review Board (DRB). She informed both the board and others in attendance that:

- 1) That the multifamily use is a Principal Use (no use permit required) in the Commercial (C) zoning district and supported by the Central Business District General Plan designation. As such, the use was not under consideration, nor could the applicant be required to undergo any additional public review related to entitlement.
- 2) The DRB functions as a quasi-judicial board and as such, members cannot discuss the cases before them outside of a public hearing with anyone, which includes friends, family, and other board members; and that “discuss” includes texts, emails, or other forms of electronic communication as well as face-to-face conversations.
- 3) The DRB is limited in scope and purview. Site plan review is conducted by professional staff, and while site planning concerns regarding parking, setbacks, site access and interior circulation, drainage, and other non-design items can be discussed, the DRB cannot consider those items in their decision making process.
- 4) That it was okay to not like the architecture or the colors, but specific corrections or concerns need to be provided. In other words, if you don’t like the red or the white, that is within the purview of the DRB; however, detailed corrective feedback needs to be provided. If the red is inappropriate, what shade/color is appropriate? If the rooflines are not in keeping with the historic nature of downtown, what rooflines are?

Director Mayday then proceeded with a presentation that set forth the requirements for approval, the site configuration, and the renderings for the building. She pointed out the Craftsman/Bungalow architectural features included in the proposed structures, including the trim detail over the doors, deep eaves with supportive corbeling, staggered low-pitched rooflines, and porches/awnings over front

entryways. Proposed landscaping details were also discussed, including the split-faced block used for retaining walls, decomposed granite and shredded bark ground cover, and a variety of plantings to camouflage the retaining walls. Upon conclusion of the presentation, Director Mayday asked if board members had any comments.

Member Foutz inquired about the wall height along Main Street and stated that it looked to her like it is a four (4) story building when you are down at the street; you have the old wall and then you have the new buildings going straight up and it didn't seem in keeping with the town having things going straight up.

Director Mayday stated that there is actually a setback that would provide a "gap" between the existing wall and where the building would be, and that the structures would not abut the retaining wall. Member Kelly stated that he didn't see anything that showed that part of the plan very well.

Director Mayday then showed the setback relative to the existing stairs and the wall. Member Foutz then asked if we had anything that would show what that wall looked like; Director Mayday stated that the wall would not be abutting the existing wall but rather set back on the site, and that there would be some grading (cut) to the land that would further reduce the building height. She further indicated where the retaining walls would be. Member Foutz asked if the buildings were at the setback line; Director Mayday stated that no, they were in fact set back from that line. Member Foutz stated that there did not appear to be enough room for a dog house or a barbeque grill; Director Mayday agreed. Member Kelly then asked if there was an elevation showing the view from the street; Director Mayday stated no. He added that that level would be where most people would see it from; that an elevation showing the view from the street would be helpful. Director Mayday stated that a request of the developer could be made; it would be difficult to get an accurate perspective. Member Foutz then stated that architects do it all the time; and that when the DRB was approving the cell tower years ago, they actually put balloons up so the height of the structure could be seen and how it would be reflected in the environment and that it would be very helpful to have a view from Selma-Mongini Park, from Main Street, from the neighbors perspective from the north; across the old ballfield; these things are insanely important; that the height of the building so close to Main Street looks a little bit uncomfortable and very obstructing and that the people living there have so little behind them and absolutely nothing in front of them; is there a sidewalk by the buildings that go along Main Street? Director Mayday stated she didn't believe there was one along Main Street; that there was access between the buildings to the stairs; Member Foutz asked if people were expected to walk through an alley to the stairs; Director Mayday referred to the landscape plan that showed ample landscaping alongside the sidewalk between the buildings and along the property line. Chair Snyder stated that there appeared to be a sidewalk between the buildings along Main Street and the property line; Director Mayday enlarged the landscaping plan and determined that there was indeed a sidewalk behind the structures. Member Foutz continued, stating that the buildings were too close together. Director Mayday further illustrated where the back and side of the building were, where the sidewalk was located, and where the property line is located, where the public right of way was, and the existing wall. Director Mayday reiterated again that the buildings were not right up against the existing wall because the existing retaining wall was well within public right of way. Member Foutz then stated that the buildings being close to each other made her uncomfortable; Director Mayday pointed out that the interior streets were 24' wide,

which is typical for this type of development. She added that the buildings were 28' high, and that the maximum building height for this zoning district was 50' tall.

Member Kelly added that his concerns were also with the view along Main Street; he was less concerned with the interior as he was with the view from Main Street. He continued, asking about the 10' wall indicated on the plans. Director Mayday replied that the walls he indicated were retaining walls, and the heights were based on the contours of the walls. She reiterated that they were all landscaped so that the view was not solely of block, but a view softened by the plantings. She continued to say that people who live along Selma-Mongini Park that looked toward the project would see landscaping and not just block wall. Member Kelly asked "so why can't we see an elevation that shows what that view would look like?" Director Mayday stated that we could talk with the developer about getting elevations. Member Kelly continued, stating that the whole section across Main Street, from what we saw of the back of the houses that will be facing that, I have a concern with that to begin with, when we get into the design of it. But that sitting on top of that hill, on top of the wall, and there's some other wall, I have no idea what that is going to look like in the end.

Member Robbins agreed, stating that he felt it was unfair to ask us to comment or vote on this property when we can't see this very critical elevation, meaning the one on Main Street. He clarified that he was not asking for one from every side, but certainly from Main Street.

Chair Snyder asked if the developer wanted to make comments; Director Mayday stated that it may be more efficient to take public comment first.

Chair Snyder then proposed opening the public hearing at 7:08. Prior to opening the public hearing, she reminded speakers that they were required to step up to the microphone, state their name, whether or not they were a Clarkdale resident, and what their concerns with the project were.

Motion by Member Robbins, second by Foutz to open the public hearing. 5 yeas 0 nays; motion carried.

Clarkdale resident Jeanne Baird stated that the town really needs affordable housing that workers can afford, and asked if a price point for the units had been determined. She also expressed her concern regarding congestion by the post office, located along Ninth Street, that many access off First South.

Drake Meinke, Clarkdale resident, stated he is the closest building to the proposed project. Clarkdale is a town that has significant national historic importance; that what sets Clarkdale apart from all other historic districts in the nation is what justifies an extra level of historic protection.

is not consistent with the historic downtown; that much of Clarkdale was on the National Register of Historic Buildings and included 386 buildings and 4,000 acres; Jerome has 40 homes; Cottonwood has 14, that makes Clarkdale 20 times more historic than Jerome. He continued, stating that Clarkdale is a model town based on The City Beautiful movement and included only the best of the best and there are only about 200 of those projects in the United States; that we have a compelling national historic story

with the Clark family that should also be taken into consideration; that Clarkdale's historic district easily qualifies for National Landmark status and UNESCO World Heritage Site.

Continuing, Mr. Meinke stated that our number one asset in this town are the historic homes which should be used to garner off attributes for new homes. He stated that "we can't just do the minimum"; that the ASU study said: "To focus new single family housing projects as infill for the neighborhoods adjacent to the downtown area rather than inside of it", and that we should be not be going with apartments instead of single family homes. "Where single-family housing is considered, it should be focused on infill opportunities in the downtown-adjacent neighborhoods and respect the historic fabric of the residential area." Continuing, Mr. Meinke stated that a national register property would be affected by this development; and that it would diminish existing historic properties.

He further stated that there were no properties in Clarkdale with garages like those proposed; the building was too tall; that there were no two-story residences in Clarkdale and that there were no balconies in Clarkdale, and that this should copy the residential buildings rather than the historic downtown. He further stated that the zero setbacks of the proposed structures were so close that his flag would touch the structures when the wind blew.

He continued, stating that there had been no conversation with the Clarkdale Historic Society or preservation commission or the National Park Service or National Trust of Historic Places was not referred to, and that the National Secretary of Interior's standards for infill should be looked at. The town historians should have been asked about this project because we have such a huge national historic district. He stated that because it is part of the historic district on the National Register, it should be reviewed by them, and stated that a Section 106 review be required of the project.

Mr. Meinke then stated that the museum would be impacted by this as it is a modern intrusion next to a building of historic significance in this town, and that we can't have that. He further requested a study on the impact of this on the historical district by this board to find out exactly how it was going to impact it, and consider a Section 106 type of study that any cell phone tower would get. Recommendations to this applicant this is not a (?) project. Make it look like an historic area of town and it will pass.

Next, Jeff Symon of 1308 Main Street, shared that he was concerned about the trail that was on the property and hinted that it may have been used by Native Americans to hike the area and wanted a study done to see if there is any historic value or arrowheads or pottery shards. He concluded by stating that the town should keep new architecture away from historic buildings.

Nathan Porter of 799 Alfonse Road followed, and stated that he was a member of the General Plan Committee. One of the important parts of the 2021 General Plan (because the new one has not yet been approved by the town) talks about what the town wants to see about development in town; one thing was to "protect the historic aesthetic and visual of the town, to maintain and strengthen Clarkdale's reputation as a historic community, and maintain Clarkdale's historic downtown character. This proposed building is going to be right in the middle of historic Clarkdale and stand out on the top of

the hill; it will be one of the first things you see as you drive up from Broadway Road. The look of the building is one of the 70's, 80's, or 90's. The buildings downtown have flat roofs, are brick or stone, the colors are very muted; my opposition to the project is that it doesn't look like an historic building at all. Mr. Porter continued, stating that he thought it could be changed so it would look like an historic building; he offered to share pictures of buildings in old historic Tempe and they strived to have them fit in to the historic character of downtown; they looked like they were built in the 20's or 30's, like all the buildings were, and recommended the project not be approved the way it is now. Mr. Porter left his illustrations with Director Mayday.

Next, Tom Whittaker of 19 North 10th street spoke. He noted that it is a real stretch to think that this abuts a public sidewalk and whether or not anyone has looked at the disability access for this and if that is not part of abutting a public sidewalk. He continued that if you expect people to make that turn by people coming out of the post office, you have more faith in human nature than I do; he stated that most of the cars would be cutting through the parking lot. Lastly, he states he retired from the printing business and words mean something to him. All the signs from the freeway say that you can go to Old Town Cottonwood or Historic Clarkdale, and there is a difference between old town and historic, and that he did not see the proposed project as being Verde Valley or historic Clarkdale.

Carol Kane of 400 Main stated that she purposely built her home to fit the historic nature- in a simple style with nothing modern; her purpose was not to make money but to live in a community.

Michael Lindner spoke next. A 59 year native of Clarkdale, Mr. Lindner spoke in support of the project. He noted that the site had been vacant for 38 years; he further supports the density and suggested a higher density would be more appropriate because it is an important element of the economic development of downtown Clarkdale; more people living within walking distance of downtown were needed to support the vision of downtown. However, the exterior appearance does not fit downtown Clarkdale; it doesn't fit the design or the materials of the town. He stated that the applicant had proposed stone rather than brick; that the sliding windows looked very 70's compared to the double-hung windows found throughout the residential district. He further stated that the development needs to establish a cohesive character with the surrounding built environment, nor did they contribute to the historic sense of the area. Mr. Lindner then offered suggestions for resolving the discrepancies and suggested a review of the architectural review of Clarkdale produced by period architects Herding and Boyd. Their study was actually critical of how Clarkdale was built and offered some solutions. The study also suggested the implementation of attached dwellings, two- and three-story buildings that were designed for the terrain of Clarkdale. He suggested that the developer take a look at that study and try to adopt something like that, which would fit in with the downtown. The implementation of the design of the structures would compliment the historic nature of the buildings downtown. This would also provide an opportunity for the developer and the Town as the design of a first-class infill development, it would be recognized by SHPO (State Historic Preservation Office), creating a lot of positive publicity for all. He encourage the DRB to table this until there could be review of alternative designs.

Next, Sandy Booth of 123 Sunset Boulevard commented that for a development of this size, the area to be contacted would be at least where she resided, if not all of Upper town and lower town as well. She

also expressed concern with the access; she wondered where visitors would park. Most importantly, she was concerned with historic compatibility and the ASU study; she did not understand the architecture at all and felt that building 2 was really hideous. She further stated that this should be modeled after commercial buildings to be more compatible with what is around it.

Carol Macklin of Cornville spoke next. She has lived in the Verde Valley for 32 years and comes to Violette's for coffee every morning. Clarkdale is a real community; this project will lose the sense of place. She sits on benches in Clarkdale and Jerome and suggests tourists visit the post office in Jerome "to see what history really looks like". She further stated that we have a museum right here that is world class, same thing. How much does that generate for this little town? Now, to have something come in that is so contemporary and right on the main street of this little town. She continued, stating that when she drives up, the first thing she sees is the cypress tree and this (Clark Memorial Clubhouse) building. Now this will sit out there right on the edge of the cliff. She went on to state that she's done a lot of archaeological hikes in this area and wanted to know if an archaeological study has been done of this site. This is a site where they would have a "sun seat", where the natives would sit in the morning and that is how they knew how to plant their crops based on the sunrise; she repeated that a study should be done before anything is done on this site. Lastly, 52 buildings with garages, there is no street parking; I've also heard there are two- and three- bedrooms; the extra people will have to park on the streets and there isn't going to be any social activity because there is no place for anyone to come and visit.

Laura Jones of Third South street requested clarifications from the Town regarding the public process to have input on traffic, the architecture, and the ultimate use of the buildings; that these are things that we've been told we can't discuss at this meeting, so she is wondering what the public input process is.

Curtis Lindner thanked the commission for the opportunity to speak. He stated that he lives in Jerome but his mom resides in Clarkdale. He sees this as not a bad situation, but the design ought to be softened up; the window configuration should be more historically accurate, and there is no way to determine how this will look coming off of Main Street. Further, he doesn't see how this matches the architecture and buildings that are already here; it looks too much like Mountain Gate; the developer should consider more stucco; the process should slow down so the developer can rework the plans. He agreed that something needs to be built there; we need places for people to live, but it needs to work with the buildings already here. He also said that his attorney advised that the Town has made some modifications to its ordinances that have put the decision making process into the professional realm; he has some deference to that and feels that a lot of those decisions should be made by the planning and zoning folks and not by the professionals that tell you what can and can't be legally put on a piece of property and you have no say; it should be the purview of the citizens of Clarkdale, and suggested a review of ordinances and make the modifications to your ordinances to match your growth and the necessary requirements.

Donna Whitmore spoke next, stating that she lived in Clarkdale on 10th street since 1991, and was present to express her concerns about the Plateau Apartments next to the post office and Copper Arts Museum. She mentioned that Clarkdale was a 110-year old town listed on the National Register of Historic Places and the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office, both of which have restrictions and requirements for entering into their oversight, including "...changes made to an historic building do not

negatively impact its National Register status, or the character of the surrounding historic district. “ While that doesn’t sound like it applies to this situation, it does show a measurable expectation that towns honor history and must preserve the character that earned them the designation and the consequent listing in the National Register. She stated that it is her belief that the proposed buildings negatively impact the character of the historic district, and if approved the Town will be violating its obligation to the National Register, the State preservation office, and the Clarkdale businesses and residential property owners. She continued stating that those who live in Clarkdale love their town and honor its history. She mentioned recent and proposed projects that were examples of dedication of the citizens of Clarkdale, and how they had stepped up to invest in the community and stimulate tourism in the town. She recounted examples of how the citizens have stepped up to support needs in the community such as the restoration of the gazebo, the repairs to the fire engine, and moving library books. She asked that the Board not dishonor the town by approving these structures.

Marshall Whitmire, Camp Verde resident, attended via Zoom. He states that he has long been a supporter of Clarkdale’s historic preservation efforts. Professionally, he has worked on historic preservation projects for 20 years in community and economic development strategic planning including historic preservation in at least 65 US communities. He stated that his experience tells him that local residents feel very strongly about their sense of place of their community and they often do not look favorably on those projects that they see as incongruent with that sense of place. He continued, stating that the second thing that his experience tells him is that the best approach for a community’s long term success is, with respect to projects like this one, is to go the extra mile or two or three miles (unintelligible), and that he sincerely hoped that would be the approach taken in this case and in so doing the project would be approved to everyone’s relative satisfaction.

Jim Elmer, Clarkdale resident, stated that while he lives in the Black Hills area, he’s been active in the town. While he understands that we need growth, he wished that the project was more reflective of the historic character. He stated that the developer could do a good job if he worked with the neighbors and the efforts were minimal; he hoped that the developer could be a better neighbor.

The last speaker was A.B. Berman, 26 Ninth Street, stated that he didn’t think it was a horrible looking building, he just didn’t think it fits in here. He doesn’t see how this meets the charter of the Design Review Board and was also of the opinion that it wouldn’t be that hard to make some adjustments so that it would fit in; he was also hoping to see more renderings that would give a better idea to see how the buildings would fit in and show how it would look like. He would encourage the request for better renderings to show what it will look like.

Noting that there were no additional speakers, the Chair closed the public comment at approximately 8:30 and invited the applicant to speak. Ralph Clemmer stated that the architecture was Craftsman-based, two story and the smallest units coming to market. He added that the design was 360 degree architecture with design features on all sides. He further stated that the intent was to create something that was affordable; the units were 850 to 1,000 square feet and served a market niche that was in demand. He reiterated that the architects spent a lot of time incorporating craftsman elements into the design and that if they tried to do brownstone buildings on this site, the project would not be affordable. He stated that there were many comments about go back and redesign, but we have all

those elements that are found in the historic homes and historic district. From an affordability standpoint, we are trying to bring in smaller units and revitalize the downtown district with a residential component, but if you think I can build this building (Clark Memorial Clubhouse) and make it affordable, it's not going to happen. We can't build masonry buildings, double frame them so we can get the plumbing and electrical in, and make them affordable. Obviously, we can change some things, but if you look at the historic homes you will see the same thing. We are trying to revitalize the downtown, but product type that is small with two bedrooms is hard to make affordable. About the parking, he continued, each unit will have its own garage, and we exceed the zoning requirements by 13 spaces. He concluded his comments by reiterating that it is a craftsman style housing development, which is what they are trying to do.

Chair Snyder then recognized Director Mayday, who recognized Maher Hazine, Town Engineer and Public Works Director, and asked him to address the parking, access, and other engineering aspects of the project. Mr. Hazine reviewed the site plan process and technical review, and stated that these issues are based on adopted standards. He further stated that the reviews are rigorous and considered things that may create problems in the future. He also stated that the public can contribute to the review by visiting his office and provide comments related to specific issues and take them under advisement, and that while acknowledging receipt, he may not be able to come back with a specific answer until he has had an opportunity to review. He then provided his email address for people to send comments, as well as a phone number to call with questions. He also noted that the access to the property was challenging; the access off Broadway was not suitable due to grade, nor was access from the private road. Staff had also expressed concerns about access to the site from First North, and advised that the design was such that no one would be driving through the parking lot to access to the site. Further, parking would be dealt with on public right of way.

Member Kelly asked about the parking and stated that while, per code it probably met the requirements, in reality we know that won't work; that garages would be used for storage rather than parking, and no driveways. He stated that many of the homes in Mountain Gate where he lives have two car garages and they still have problems with parking in the street. He added that there is no reason to think that the garages will be used for parking, and asked that the parking be taken into consideration. Mr. Hazine stated that most developments have streets that are wide enough to accommodate on-street parking; however, the streets proposed here were not wide enough for on-street parking, and the applicant had addressed the garages being used solely for parking as part of the CC & R's and/or lease agreement and it thus becomes an enforcement issue for the HOA. He also noted that because these are private roads, the landlord/declarant had the ability to restrict parking to garages and was also responsible for enforcement. Member Kelly reiterated that the parking should be taken into account as on-street parking would become an issue.

Director Mayday then addressed some of the questions asked and statements made during the public hearing. A lot of comments were related to the historic aspects of the project, or the lack thereof, and noted that there is a difference between what the DRB can consider and what people are allowed to talk about; she stated that people can comment on whatever they want – they can say they don't want apartments here; it's just that the DRB cannot consider. The process for this, based on the DRB's decision, will differ. If the DRB decides to send the project back for additional review, this item is tabled

until the next meeting where it will be reviewed and take additional public comment; that happens again and again until there are enough votes to approve the project. That is how people can participate. She continued that her office is open and she is willing to discuss the project with members of the public in person, via email, or on the phone. There are things that statutorily we have to abide by, and there are places where we have some latitude, and those are the places that we try to use to get the project to fit the neighborhood. She continued, stating that the developer has the right to ask us to review the project and provide them with comments – that is the purpose of this meeting. Director Mayday also commented that those who spoke were respectful and that the tone was appreciated; she's had meetings where things have gotten ugly and it was nice to sit through a meeting where people were respectful and provided good input so that we have some direction moving forward.

She then turned to specific statements made by speakers, starting with the request for archaeological studies, stating that SHPO has an archaeologist that maintains very closely held maps of archaeological sites that they do not share with the public, because they identify undisturbed Native American sites that would be ruined if their locations were known. We review these sites with them, and if there are sites on this location, we are notified and respond accordingly.

With respect to parking, Director Mayday stated that there is reality and there is what is required in code; we have to deal with what is required in code. She shared that the developer stated that tenants/owners would be required to park in the garages during the neighborhood meeting, and that they have the ability to insist that the garages be used solely for parking. She also noted that the applicant provided overflow parking in excess of what is required by code; while people have concerns about it, that is an issue that is addressed in code. She also clarified that there are not 52 buildings but rather 13 buildings with 52 units among them, and also clarified again that just because certain things are not the purview of the DRB doesn't mean they can't be discussed, they just cannot be used as a basis for decisionmaking. Concluding her remarks, Director Mayday recommended the item be sent back to staff and the developer for additional work in response to comments received and tabled to the next meeting.

Chair Snyder stated that there was more work to be done, and that it was critical for the board members to articulate to staff and the developers and the community what it is we want to see. What kind of changes do we anticipate seeing the next time around? Chair Snyder then asked Member Robbins for his input.

Member Robbins noted that affordable housing was a critical element to all cities right now, and this one fulfills that, but was surprised that residential was allowed in Commercial. He stated that he had the same concerns that the audience had and feels that it doesn't fit the nature of the city.

Member Kaempfe had the same impression and shared Mr. Lindner's sentiments regarding the project. He states that he has difficulty finding something to rent himself, but as guardians of downtown and the historic district, he didn't see this particular plan fitting in that culture and does not care for this particular design.

Chair Snyder commented that she echoed the comments regarding the need for development and particularly on this piece of property, and strongly supports the condo-style development at this location. The appearance of that property is critical to Clarkdale; she was adamant that she doesn't want to see something new that is trying to look good. Chair Snyder continued, saying that new and modern are good; she didn't want to see someone pretend like something is historic when it is not. Something that does catch your eye and say that we have diversity in downtown; that says that there are options. She continued, saying that when you look at the buildings on Main Street, they are actually pretty plain; while there is variety in the single family houses, but looking downtown the buildings are flat and continuous and that while some of the roof lines have details, many have been knocked off and the detail is gone. Her preference is for color – brick red, muted oranges, muted yellows, and reiterated that her preference was to see something eye-catching and not something just trying to be old.

Member Foutz commented next, stating that we can agree on the need for housing, but that was about it; she stated that the reason these buildings would stand out was because of the contrast; that while the bright white works on St. Cecilia's, it would not work on buildings here. She also stated that there is a total difference between the downtown area and the houses; these don't fit the streetscape; we are dealing with looking across the native landscape to the mountains, etcetera. She continued, stating that she was at the lower part of Clarkdale and she had houses in Mountain Gate intruding on her view; that once they had dark roofs and were painted natural colors, they receded from view; that the homes, while under construction, interfered with her view. She continued, discussing her dislike of the white that appears in Mountain Gate while homes were under construction, and viewed the "white in here that absolutely kills you." She differentiated between St. Cecilia's, which is monochromatic white and away and not trying to sit (unintelligible); if it were sitting in the parking lot here, next to these buildings, it would be too contrasting and very disturbing. What was wrong with this proposal is the amount of contrast, and if you took out the white, it wouldn't knock your eyes out. She continued, stating that she didn't want to see the buildings as she's coming up the hill because they would take her away from the surrounding area. Seeing them in Scottsdale would not bother her because the natural environment is already gone.

Continuing, Member Foutz commented that she understood the need to keep the cost down, but did not know how to accommodate that; that the best example she had seen of a new building incorporating the elements of Jerome and Clarkdale was the never-built clubhouse at Mountain Gate; while it was probably extremely expensive, it was actually gorgeous and the designer said that what she used was going out into the community and saying that she wanted to grab that element and this element and incorporating those elements in there, without it looking faux. However, she continued, quality design and these – her husband taught architecture at ASU for years – these look like college level design project to her and not something of quality. To keep the costs down may be important, but to drive up the hill and you see this building from down below or from a distance, I want something that is not going to take your eye away from the Copper Museum. She continued, stating that there wouldn't be a whole lot of landscaping with these, where with upper town you have street, landscaping, and then the houses, but that this was so crowded together that she didn't even know if there would be room for landscaping and the project would not be softened – the walls would but the buildings are not. Yes, we need affordable housing, yes we need to keep the prices down, no, she didn't know how to do that, but we really need to do something that we really want to look at. Further, she didn't consider these units

livable when you have garages for parking, and spoke about the difficulty she had in finding a storage unit. Next, she commented on the lack of space for a barbeque, a dog house, or a storage shed and that seemed very difficult to live in. She then stated that she couldn't speak about the density, but aesthetically the density is going to be affected here; that when she met with Director Mayday and discussed the idea that children are going to live here there is only a little bit of outdoor space; there are parks right across the street and full of goatheads but would likely be playing in the street because they don't even have a sidewalk, but again, that is not our purview.

Member Kelly spoke next, and agreed with much that has been said before; he understands the need for affordable housing; however, this is about that plan and how it is going to fit in; if it were by the college, no one would have a problem with it. Because it is so close to the Copper Museum- about the historic downtown section- you mentioned that this has craftsman style or craftsman attributes, it looks nothing craftsman, and it really needs to fit in down there because it abuts that part of town. He continued, stating that the Board did not have elevations, especially from the street, from the Museum's point of view, from the Post office point of view, to see what that is going to look like. If I were going to drive down the street and go to the museum and I looked directly to the left, and I see those big, square, industrial looking windows, I might just drive on down the street. And that is what I am afraid of is going to happen – people coming into town for the first time, especially if they are coming in from Old Town, that is going to be their first impression of downtown, and it's not going to be an historic impression.

He continued, stating that the things that Ruth showed for the guidelines and stuff, things like not having square windows, none of this meets those guidelines. Based on that alone, we would have to reject it; we don't have enough true information from those points of view to make a 100% accurate decision. Member Kelly then stated that "we can all agree that it does not fit into the historic downtown view" and that "our job is to make sure that this fits in with downtown, and in my opinion, it does not." He then concluded his remarks, stating that it could fit in, and he understood there were money aspects and such, but that's the way it works – those things just have to be worked out.

Member Kaempfe then discussed the three (3) ways into town: Clarkdale Parkway, Main Street, and Broadway. We only get one chance to get this right.

Chair Snyder then reiterated the request for more elevations; that seeing the structures in the context of the built environment would be helpful in determining how it fit. A "big picture" view would be more helpful. Member Kelly then asked the board to consider the impact of the rear of the buildings being just a couple of feet away from the museum; that they were complete opposites and they do not go together – nobody can deny that. Member Foutz added that she'd like to see a 3-dimensional model because she is having trouble picturing how big these houses are, and with the topography; she stated that she's never been good at reading those. She requested that balloons be floated so people can see how high it is going to be and it can be seen from below the wall because these are tall buildings. She further stated that if the colors were good and the materials were good, maybe the elevations wouldn't matter so much. Chair Snyder added that if she could see these buildings relative to the museum, that would help. Member Foutz stated there was a lack of continuity; Member Kelly commented that the elevations looked like the buildings were further apart than they really were.

Chair Snyder then called for a motion to send the application back to staff for further work. Member Kaempfe motioned to send the application 09316 back to staff for further work; Member Kelly seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

The applicant, Ralph Clemmer, then asked what it was that the Board wanted to see. Member Foutz stated that she wanted to see something like the Mountain Gate clubhouse, and there were elements there that could be incorporated into this project; and that the Craftsman style does not work in this area. Mr. Clemmer stated that there were houses that were Craftsman style; Member Foutz stated that they were not near this site and they did not relate. Mr. Clemmer then asked for clarification regarding the design of the clubhouse and whether it was the '05 version; Member Foutz answered in the affirmative. Mr. Clemmer then stated that it was a multi-million dollar building and there was no way it could be constructed today. Chair Snyder then reminded everyone that this item was complete.

Chair Snyder then thanked everyone for attending and called for a 5-minute break, and asked members of the public to hold conversations outside of the building as the meeting needed to continue.

The meeting was reconvened at 8:43 by Chair Snyder, who introduced the next item on the agenda. Because of her interest in the Highlander Laundromat, she recused herself from the Board and turned the meeting over to Vice Chair Matthew Kaempfe.

Director Mayday provided a brief presentation regarding the proposed signage over the door of the Highlander Laundromat, located at 10 N. Ninth Street in Clarkdale. Director Mayday stated that the proposed signage and the existing signage were well within the maximum allowed for this structure.

Vice Chair Kaempfe opened the public hearing at approximately 8:45 p.m. No members of the public were present to address the Board; the public hearing was then closed.

The applicant then addressed the commission, stating that this submittal was conceptual and she would be willing to change the colors. Commissioner Foutz commented that when the Board initially approved the window signage, the colors were too dark; this, however, this is far enough off the street and ties into the colors and has enough contrast and the door helps tie it in there. She further commented that even though there is white on there, she liked it because the white was used in the correct way to draw your eye to it.

Board Member Robbins commented that the sign was easy to read, attractive, and fits the area. Member Kelly commented that he had no problems with the colors and it was his opinion that they were very close to the door. Board Member Kaempfe commented that he liked it a lot; he just wished it was the shape of Mingus.

Vice Chair Kaempfe then called for a motion; Member Kelly moved to approve application no. 093161, signage for Highlander Laundromat; second by Member Robbins. Motion approved unanimously.

Chair Snyder then returned to the dais and asked for a motion to adjourn. Motion by Foutz, second by Kelly to adjourn the meeting. Motion passed unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 8:57 pm.

DRAFT